DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 352 520 CE 062 675

AUTHOR Copa, George H.; Pease, Virginia H.
TITLE The Comprehensive High School: An Historical Perspective.
INSTITUTION National Center for Research in Vocational Education, Berkeley, CA.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Vocational and Adult Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Dec 92
CONTRACT V051A80004-92A
NOTE 64p.; In "New Designs for the Comprehensive High School. Volume II--Working Papers"; see CE 062 664.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Historical Materials (060)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Curriculum; Educational Anthropology; *Educational Change; *Educational Development; *Educational History; Educational Innovation; *Educational Practices; Educational Principles; Educational Research; Educational Technology; Educational Trends; Guidelines; High Schools; Integrated Curriculum; Relevance (Education); Role of Education; School Organization; School Role; *Teaching Methods; Vocational Education

ABSTRACT

This report charts a brief history of the comprehensive high school in the United States designed particularly to highlight those key decisions that make them what they are. The first and longest part of the paper is organized chronologically into sections with the following headings: 1600-1890--Getting Started; 1890-1920--Basic Reform/Social Efficiency; 1920-1940--Reorientation/Being Progressive; 1940-1960--Reaction/Subject Centering; 1960-1980--Relevance/Equity; and 1980s--Return to Basics/Excellence. Within each section, key statements, studies, decisions, and changes are cited along with analysis of their reasons, actors, and consequences where apparent. The second part of the paper analyzes and summarizes the preceding descriptions of the development of the comprehensive high school in the United States. The following characteristics are examined: (1) growth in size of population served; (2) definition of comprehensive high school; (3) purpose of comprehensive high school; (4) recommended curriculum; (5) recommended methods of instruction; (6) important issues debated; and (7) source of leadership in the national commissions and study groups reviewed in this paper. These characteristics are summarized in a table for the time periods addressed. The report also lists the following issues concerning the comprehensive high school: purpose, curriculum that best follows from the purpose, instructional methods best used to teach the curriculum, and high school organization. Thirty-four references are listed. (YLB)

ED352520

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

THE COMPREHENSIVE HIGH SCHOOL: AN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

by

George H. Copa

Virginia H. Pease

This paper was developed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Vocational and Adult Education, U. S. Department of Education, for the National Center for Research in Vocational Education. While this paper has undergone review by project staff and the project's external Design Group, this document has not been reviewed using the customary NCRVE manuscript review procedures.

National Center for Research in Vocational Education
University of California-Berkeley
University of Minnesota Site

CE062675

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE COMPREHENSIVE HIGH SCHOOL: AN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

The purpose of this report is to chart a brief history of the comprehensive high school in the United States designed particularly to highlight those key decisions that make them what they are. In so doing, the perspective taken is that the so-called comprehensive high schools we see on the American landscape—and now in many other countries—are human productions fashioned after what was considered to be practical at the time. The practical considerations entering into their evolving-form means reaching for ideals and being realistic about operating constraints. These considerations are people-made with a history exposing key decisions that have made them what they are. Therefore, the emphasis for analysis in this report was given to seemingly important national statements, decisions, and studies about comprehensive high schools. The limits of time available and length of the report required the selection of only the most important, and then only a brief treatise on each.

The report was developed through use of historical analyses of original writings related to comprehensive high schools and secondary analyses of these writings. The review starts in the early 1600s and traces the comprehensive high school's development through to the 1980s. The first section of the paper is organized by chronology with the following headings:

- 1600-1890—Getting Started
- 1890-1920—Basic Reform/Social Efficiency
- 1920-1940—Reorientation/Being Progressive
- 1940-1960—Reaction/Subject Centering
- 1960-1980—Relevance/Equity
- 1980s —Return to Basics/Excellence

Within each section, key statements, studies, decisions, and changes are cited along with analysis of their reasons, actors, and consequences where apparent. Following this section is an attempt to look across the years of development in terms of selected characteristics of the comprehensive high school: scope, purpose, curriculum, instruction, and leadership.

What became evident during the review was that many of the characteristics of comprehensive high schools often taken for granted (as givens) might profitably be

submitted to requestioning—a recognition that things did not always exist as they are today. Conscious decisions (however complex) were made to make them the way they are—these decisions can be revisited to examine reasons behind them and whose interests were served, as well as intended and actual consequences. Consideration can be given to the appropriateness of these decisions for present and future conditions.

1600-1890: Getting Started

One must begin this story someplace, so why not 1607 with the Pilgrims' landing? The first schooling in this country was done in the home, a combination of elementary and secondary education. It was an early form of *life adjustment education*. Next came the church as an educational agency for both young people and adults—stress was on learning codes of behavior as guides for daily living. Those who could afford to, brought tutors for their families from England or France. Also imported for vocational training was the guild system, in which crafts were learned by apprenticeships from experts. The first formal schools were the *home* or *kitchen* schools in which women gathered a few children in their kitchens to teach the rudiments of reading, writing, and arithmetic.

Next came the Latin Grammar schools, which can be thought of as a combination elementary and secondary school with students entering at age seven or eight and leaving at fifteen or sixteen. Their purpose was the preparation of selected boys (and much later girls) for admission to college. The first Latin Grammar school, the Boston Latin School, opened its doors in 1635. For the next one hundred years these schools dominated the educational scene. Another import from Europe, the curriculum of these schools was of a classical nature (i.e., Latin, Greek, Hebrew, history, Bible, and mathematics). Here one also sees the first substantial influences of colleges on the program of studies in the elementary and secondary schools. On different dimensions, religion was usually an integral part of these schools—separation of church and state was not an issue; rather, integration was the norm. These were schools with stern learning environments (e.g., recitation, rote memory, corporal punishment) with few of the niceties of present day high schools.

In 1647 the Commonwealth of Massachusetts lead the way toward public support for schools by passage of the Old Deluder law. This law set a precedent for state

responsibility for public schools. The law called for towns of fifty families or more to provide instruction in reading and writing and towns of one hundred families to establish grammar schools as a way to make sure that citizens could read the scriptures and thereby delude Satan. Even though the penalties for not acting in accord with this law were trivial and not enforced, the law did establish the idea of state sanctions against communities not providing educational opportunities. However, the Latin Grammar schools established as a result, fulfilled the needs of only a small, elite part of the population; these schools were *not* truly public in the sense of being free and open to all.

From the mid 1700s until the Civil War period, a second type of institution emerged but providing secondary education—the academy. The academy was designed to better meet the needs of western expansion and the need for skilled workers in a nation moving toward industrialization. The first academy, the Philadelphia Academy and Charitable School, was set up by Benjamin Franklin in 1751. The purpose of the academy was to prepare young people for success in life and the business world—study of English (rather than Latin) was emphasized. Classical subjects also were included, as well as with modern languages and science. These institutions formed a *bridge* of sorts for translational form before the grammar schools and the public high schools. They made secondary education attractive and available to the middle class by increasing the variety of occupations for which preparation was given, and reducing tuition. Academies were supported by endowments, tuition, and in some cases, state funds. Although neither wholly public nor private, for a time the academy served as the popular institution for the masses of students. By 1850 there were approximately 6,000 academies—at the time it was the dominant institution providing secondary education.

In 1821, the first U.S. high school, Latin Classical School, was founded in Boston. Three years after its opening the name was changed to English (as opposed to Latin) High School. The three-year curriculum stressed English, mathematics, history, and science.

Shortly after the Civil War the public high school began to emerge (in contrast to the academy) "as the institution that the people of the United States would choose for the education of their adolescents" (Raubinger, Rowe, Piper, & West, 1969, p. 9). By 1860 there were about three hundred high schools of this kind usually small and selective (e.g., entrance by examination) schools. Their number increased to six thousand by 1890, with

still an average enrollment of only forty. The first public high schools were set up in 1838 in Philadelphia, in 1847 in Cincinnati, and in 1856 in Chicago. While in 1870 the number enrolled in the common school (elementary level) was about seven million and by 1890 about 12.5 million, the public high schools enrolled only 80,000 in 1870 and 360,000 in 1890. These facts serve to point out that these public high schools were still not attracting a high percentage of students—with only 360,000 enrolled in 1890, there were almost three million of the appropriate age group not enrolled.

Starting in the 1830s, the common school movement was taking effect at the elementary school level, only to have a much later effect at the high school level. The movement occurred as a series of state movements for the reform of elementary education, which were congruent in time and goals moving from East to West across the country. The goals were: (a) free education for all, (b) creation of a trained educational profession, and (c) state control over local schools. In essence, it was a commitment to deliberate use of education as a tool for social manipulation and what was seen as social progress. The idea was for all young people to be educated in common subjects and values—to socialize students to the needs of a democracy and industrialized economy (this goal was particularly focused on the children of the poor and of immigrants, who were then not likely to be attending school). It led to elimination of tuition for the then-called district schools, age grading, to standardized curricula and tests. (The district school was a legal entity created earlier as the population moved West and there was a need to band together over a larger geographic area in order to provide tax resources as partial support of schools). During this time the enrollment in school of youth ages five to nineteen increased from forty percent in 1840, to fifty to fifty-six percent in 1850, and to sixty percent in 1860. It was not until the 1900s that the concepts of the common school would be extended to the public high school.

Also during the 1800s, a series of laws and court cases aided the extension of secondary education in the United States. In 1827, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts passed a law that towns of five hundred or more families maintain a high school with a ten-month program. The first compulsory attendance law was passed in this same state twenty five years later. On another front in 1874, with the Kalamazoon case decided by the Supreme Court of Michigan, precedent was set for school districts to use public funds to establish and operate high schools—this affirmed that the secondary school was a legitimate part of a public school program. From here, the public high school took hold as

a link between public elementary school and public university and began to develop its present character—the word *comprehensive* was, however, not yet in use.

1890-1920: Basic Reform/Social Efficiency

Committee on Secondary School Studies

The Committee on Secondary School Studies was appointed by the National Education Association in 1892. As noted earlier, this was a time when most youth of high school age were still not in school. Those who were in high school were mainly from the elite class and "the average length of the school term was 135 days and the average number of days attended per student enrolled was 86. Total expenditures on public education were only $140,000,000" (Raubinger, Rowe, Piper, & West, 1969, p. 10). The high school was very similar to college in curriculum, student body, and staff.

The Committee on Secondary School Studies was composed of five university presidents, a college professor, a commissioner of education, and three principals. It was chaired by Charles W. Eliot, President of Harvard University. The Committee had nine subcommittees, each responsible for a subject matter area (e.g., Latin, Greek, English, mathematics). One perspective on their charge was that it was to reduce the chaotic relationship between high school preparation and college admission.

The report of this committee was probably the first that could be considered national in scope and influence. It was to set a pattern for secondary schools in terms of purpose and course offerings and schedule. The influence of the committee report came from the prestige of its members, their access to means of reaching educational leaders (e.g., journals, conferences), and their control over college admission standards. Their challenge was to bring some kind of order out of the often chaotic conditions of secondary education curricula across the country, mainly so that graduates of these schools could be admitted to colleges and universities with the expectation that they would have some common and essential background preparation.

In terms of the purpose of the high school, the committee's recommendations seem to imply preparation for college—very specific recommendations were made about academic subjects such as Latin, Greek, English, modern languages, mathematics, science,

history, and geography. Very little is said about subjects that might be called avocational or vocational, except that they might be provided as options. A major point of unanimous agreement designed to simplify high school programs was "that every subject which is taught at all in a secondary school should be taught in the same way and to the same extent to every pupil so long as he pursues it, no matter what the probable destination of the pupil may be, or at what point his education is to cease" (Raubinger, Rowe, Piper & West, 1969, p. 39).

The lay out of high school course offerings and student programs recommended by the Committee closely approximates what one might see today, except for changes in the course titles and time allotment to courses. Although the general tone of the recommendation appears to belie a purpose of the high school as preparation for college, the last section of the general report states:

> The secondary schools of the United States, taken as a whole, do not exist for the purpose of preparing boys and girls for college. Only an insignificant percentage of the graduates of these students go to college or scientific schools. Their main function is to prepare for the duties of life that small proportion of all the children in the country—a proportion small in number, but very important to the welfare of the nation—who show themselves able to profit by an education prolonged to the eighteenth year, and whose parents are able to support them while they remain so long at school.... A secondary school program intended for national use must therefore be made for those children whose education is not being pursued beyond the secondary school. The preparation of a few pupils for college or scientific school should in the ordinary secondary school be the incidental, and not the principal object. (Raubinger, Rowe, Piper, & West, 1969, p. 70)

Church and Sedlak suggest that "The committee argued... not that a college preparatory course was not the best education for everyone at the high school level, but rather, that the best preparation for life was also the best preparation for college. The committee wished to enable students to postpone their decisions about attending college as long as possible" (p. 294). Their approach to dealing with the fate of the student who did not go on to college (then about three-quarters of the high school population) was to decrease emphasis on the high school's purpose of preparing students for college and set up standards for a curriculum that would prepare students adequately for life or college. Four prototype curriculum programs were proposed entitled classical, Latin-scientific, modern languages, and English. The programs were similar in requiring four years of English, four of mathematics, three of history and four to nine years of foreign languages.

A significant difference with the past regarding college admission requirements seen in the Committee's recommendation was to consider the quality and depth of instruction as more important than subject matter. Their proposal established a limited elective system and opened the high school curriculum to modern subjects (e.g., science, history, English). Major reaction to these recommendations came from the classicists who felt threatened in terms of their subjects (e.g., Latin, Greek) and the consequences of favoring utility over culture. It is appropriate to remember the context of the high school at this time: the Committee probably believed that the high school would remain the training ground of the elite, that it was an integral part of higher education, and that it was not an institution for the masses (elementary and vocational training institutions were to serve this purpose). Even so, the committee's primary concern seemed to be to set up program standards so that graduates of their *good* high schools could be readily admitted to colleges if the students so chose.

Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Educations

After 1900, criticism of the report of the Committee on Secondary School Studies began to take a new twist—it was too influenced by the college interests and was too narrow in its preparation for life. With the professionalization of secondary educators, they moved away from the college image and more toward a similarity of interest to the elementary school. With this came a move to make secondary education a part of the *common* school—to make it a part of universal education for all youth. During this period, the curriculum of the high school was called into question as to its usefulness in real life for all youth. Secondary school leaders advocated a function of the high school in assisting youth in efficiently finding their place in society and being maximally productive in this place. In this way the high schools promised to make society run more smoothly with less conflict by shaping students to social needs. Vocational education was a very visible concern for secondary school leaders, justified by inadequacy in the supply of trained workers, by high drop-out rates from schools because of lack of relevance, as a way to deal with needs of less bright students, and as a clear link of high school to preparation for life. The emphasis on differential preparation for work in high school brought into play the traditional doctrines of democracy and the importance of a common school for everybody. The implications of this interplay were most explicit in the decisions that this position required of high school staff—if there was to be preparation for different work roles, how were the parting decisions to be made?

The vocational guidance movement began about 1906 with Frank Parsons (cited in Church & Sedlak, 1976), whose social engineering ideology can be seen in his statement, "Life can be moulded into any conceivable form. Draw up your specifications for man... and if you will give me control of the environment and time enough, I will clothe your dreams in flesh and blood" (p. 307). Given the historical content of a prevalent the commitment to social efficiency, and the context that most of vocational education was developing in institutions separate from the high school, the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education was appointed to lay out a new direction and framework for secondary education—enter the *comprehensive high school.*

The commission was appointed by the Board of Directors of the National Education Association in 1913. It evolved out of an earlier committee focused on the study of high school-college relationships. The commission was chaired (and their reports mostly authored) by Clarence Kingsley, who had recently been a mathematics instructor at Brooklyn Manual Training High School. In stark contrast to the Committee on Reorganization of School Studies, its membership was largely drawn from secondary schools rather than universities. The Commission, like the earlier Committee, had a series of subcommittees investigating various subject matter areas (this time including vocational education areas) and special topics.

The Report of the commission published in 1918 (cited in Raubinger, Rowe, Piper, & West, 1969) was indeed aimed at reorganizing secondary education. Its initial sentence was to set its tone, "Secondary education should be determined by the needs of the society to be served, the character of the individuals to be educated, and the knowledge of educational theory and practice available" (p. 102). The placing of *society* before the *individual*, where there is conflict, is an echo heard throughout the report. The role of education in a democracy was also stated up front: "Education in the United States should be guided by a clear conception of the meaning of democracy" (p. 105). The meaning proposed was: "The purpose of democracy is to organize society that each member may develop his personality primarily through activities designed for the well-being of his fellow members and of society as a whole" (p. 105). The implication for education was that "education in a democracy, both within and without the school, should develop in each individual the knowledge, interests, ideals, habits, and powers whereby he will find his place and use that place to shape both himself and society toward even nobler ends" (p. 105). Based on a casual analysis of the activities of an individual, the Commission

proposed its famous Seven Cardinal Principles outlining the purpose of secondary education: (a) health, (b) command of fundamental processes, (c) worthy home membership, (d) vocation, (e) citizenship, (f) worthy use of leisure, and (g) ethical character. These were the ways secondary education was to contribute to the social efficiency of society.

The then prevalent interest in vocational education was set in perspective to the other objectives by the Committee's statement that "it is only as the pupil sees his vocation in relation to his citizenship and his citizenship in the light of his vocation that he will be prepared for effective membership in an industrial democracy" (p. 112). This approach of first stating purpose and then ways and means was to serve as a guide to future attempts to state directions for education.

In arguing for comprehensiveness the report states, "No curriculum in the secondary school can be regarded as satisfactory unless it gives due attention to each of the objectives of education outlined herein" (p. 117). The curriculum approach recommended for secondary education was a combination of specializing and unifying functions:

> The ideal of a democracy . . . involves, on the one hand, specialization whereby individuals and groups of individuals may become effective in the various vocations and other fields of human endeavor, and, on the other hand, unification whereby the members of that democracy may obtain those common ideas, common ideals, and common modes of thought, feeling, and action that make for cooperation, social cohesion, and social solidarity. (p. 118)

Specialization was tied to progress, unification to concerted action. Specialization was to occur through a curriculum differentiated by vocation (e.g., agriculture, business, clerical, industrial, fine arts, household arts, and academic). Unification was to be accomplished by housing the students under one roof and requiring a series of *constant* subjects for all students. The other categories of subjects were the curriculum *variables* (vocational) and free *electives* (nonvocational, special interest). The degree of training for specific vocations was to depend on the vocation, facilities available to the school, and opportunity the student may have to obtain training later.

The report advocated the notion of a comprehensive high school (earlier called a *composite* or *cosmopolitan* high school) which embraced "all curriculum in one unified

organization" and "should remain the standard type of secondary school in the United States" (p. 121). This position on the comprehensive school was based on increased effectiveness for vocational education (e.g., ease and flexibility in changing vocational objective, wider range of knowledge by teachers of various vocations, opportunity for students to develop personal contacts valuable to them vocationally), for unification (e.g., development of degree of self-consciousness as groups and federation into larger whole), for objectives other than vocational (e.g., economy of scale in purchase of equipment, wider offering for leisure activities, larger faculty from which to draw leadership), for accessibility (e.g., students can go to closest school rather than one specializing in their vocational choice), for adaptation to local needs (e.g., curriculum can bend to local community needs and interests), for effective organization of curriculum (e.g., allows justification of curriculum directors).

The final recommendation was to make secondary education essential for all youth:

> To the extent to which the objectives outlined herein are adopted as the controlling aims of education, to that extent will it be recognized that an extended education for every boy and girl is essential to the welfare, and even to the existence, of democratic society . . . . This commission holds that education should be so reorganized that every normal boy and girl will be encouraged to remain in school to the age of eighteen, on full time if possible, otherwise on part time. (pp. 127-128)

The major critical reaction to the commission's report came from a faction of the vocational education community represented by David Snedden, in his position that the report missed the significance of vocational education and that only an imitation of vocational education could be provided within the constraints of the comprehensive high school—specialized vocational schools were necessary to do an adequate job.

1920-1940: Reorientation/Being Progressive

The Reorientation time period spans from the end of World War I, through the Great Depression, to the beginning of World War II. Besides these tumultuous socio-economic happenings, it was once again a time of substantial increases in enrollments for the secondary school as it moved to its role as part of mass education. In 1920, 2.5 million students were enrolled in secondary schools; by 1930 it was 4.8 million; and by 1940, 7.1 million. Expressed as percents of the youth ages fourteen to seventeen, the increase for

these years was 32.3 percent, 51.4 percent, and 73.3 percent, respectively. Four studies all taking place during the 1930s will be used to suggest the types of decisions being made about the comprehensive high school during this time. Recapitulating, this was a period in which it was reaffirmed that the secondary school should remain comprehensive and that it be made the custodian for *all* American youth. Those responsible for secondary education during this time seemed to come to the position that large numbers of these youth were incapable of scholarship. The effects of the depression and war promoted much debate about the role of the school in social reconstruction (as opposed to socialization only)—this new role was at least partially rejected in the interests of the notion of a wider vista for the working of democracy. The twenty year period ended with the beginnings of the idea of *life adjustment education* and the triad differentiation of the curriculum into *academic*, *vocational*, and *other* (general).

Committee on Reorientation of Secondary Education

The Committee on Reorientation of Secondary Education, composed of leaders in secondary school administration, was appointed in 1932 by the National Association of Secondary School Principals and made two reports during 1936 and 1937 dealing with the issues and functions of the secondary schools. The ten identified issues facing secondary education concerned questions of: (a) educating all youth at public expense, (b) retaining all pupils as long as they wish to remain, (c) development of individual versus contribution to society, (d) common or differentiated curriculum, (e) including vocational training versus providing only general education, (f) emphasis on preparation for advanced studies versus recognition of the value of courses for all purposes, (g) acceptance of conventional school subject categories versus categories related to students' future social functions, presenting merely organized knowledge or including attitudes and ideas, adjustment to prevailing social ideals versus reconstruction of society, and secondary education as merely a phase in a longer education continuum or as a distinct yet articulated part with peculiar functions of its own.

After historical analysis and considering pro and con arguments on each issue, the committee took the following positions: (a) continue a definite program in the school to integrate youth with each other and with society to develop socially-minded and socially-active individuals; (b) satisfy the important immediate and probable future needs of students; (c) acquaint students with the materials of living, represent the accepted way of life and reveal opportunities for higher activity in the major fields of their heritage of

experience and culture; (d) explore higher and increasingly specialized interests, aptitudes, and capacities of students toward further study or work; (e) systematize knowledge in ways that show a wide range of application; (f) develop interests in major fields of human activity as means to happiness, to social progress, and to continued growth; (g) guide students into wholesome and worthwhile social relationships, maximum personal adjustment and advanced study or vocation in which they will be most successful and happy; (h) use in all courses methods that demand independent thought, principles of research, and provide practice (individual and cooperative) in the activities of an educated person; (i) begin and gradually increase differentiation of education on evidence of demonstrated aptitudes and interests along with general education to the extent possible and profitable; and (j) retain each student until the law of diminishing returns begins to operate.

Differentiation of the curriculum was rationalized on the basis of individual differences, differences in vocational choice, differences in institution of further education, differences in interests of pupils—the difficulty was in deciding when differentiation should begin and how much should be provided. The committee suggested the principle:

Concerning the issue of role of the school in reconstruction of society versus adjusting to prevailing conditions, the committee took a mid-road; "secondary education should dispose schools favorably to social change," but it "should not plan the reconstruction of society in any sense that would commit the young to specific changes in the social order. It may legitimately attempt to foresee the probable course of events and to prepare youth to deal with it intelligently" (p. 136).

Commission on the Relation of School and College

The Commission on the Relation of School and College was appointed in 1930 by the Progressive Education Association to explore possibilities for better coordination of school and college work and to seek a way to provide freedom for secondary school to attempt what was felt to be needed—a fundamental reconstruction. The resulting study began in 1933 and concluded in 1941 with a five-volume report; the study was more commonly known as the Eight-Year Study. It was actually an experimental-type study involving twenty-nine high schools from across the country and three hundred colleges and universities. The colleges and universities agreed to relax their admission policies as a means to give the experimental schools an opportunity to reconstruct their curriculums and

yet not penalize their students who might wish to go on to school. Later students from experimental and control schools were compared in terms of success in college.

The finding of *no difference* in experimental and control students was important to modification of traditional college entry requirements thereby making it possible for schools to experiment with their programs without jeopardizing opportunities of students who wished to go on to school. However, of equal relevance were the inadequacies identified in the secondary schools and what was learned from the experimental schools concerning their resolution. The list of inadequacies posed by the commission was not too unlike what might be heard some fifty years later. Secondary schools in the United States: (a) did not have a clear-cut, definite, central purpose; (b) failed to give students a sincere appreciation of their heritage as American citizens; (c) did not prepare adequately for the responsibilities of community; (d) seldom challenged the students of first-rate ability; (e) neither knew their students well nor guided them wisely; (f) failed to create conditions necessary for effective learning; (g) seldom released and developed creative energies of students; (h) had a curriculum that was removed from the real concerns of youth; (i) traditional subjects had lost much of their vitality and significance; (j) produced graduates were not competent in the use of the English language; (k) showed little evidence of unity in the work of the typical high school; (l) evidenced a lack of continuity from semester to semester or year to year which almost matched the absence of unity; (m) were characterized by complacency; (n) had teachers who were not equipped for their responsibilities; (o) had few principals conceived of their work in terms of democratic leadership of the community, teachers, and students; (p) were without any comprehensive evaluation of staff; (q) issued a diploma that meant only that the student had done whatever was necessary to accumulate the required number of units; and (r) maintained a relationship between school and college that was unsatisfactory to both institutions. All this back in 1934!

Initially they suggested that these inadequacies were due to the rapid growth in schools, the necessity of employing inadequately prepared teachers, and the lack of time to adjust to new responsibilities. What did they learn about dealing with these inadequacies in the experimental schools? They learned that: (a) colleges can secure the information needed for admission decisions without restricting the secondary school to a prescribed curriculum; (b) secondary schools can be trusted with responsibility for their curriculums; (c) failure of schools and colleges has resulted in much waste of time, money, and energy; (d) effective school reconstruction requires thorough preparation (meaning time,

cooperative deliberation involving all teachers and administrators as well as parents and students), a non-piecemeal approach, research, exploration, experimentation, and evaluation; (e) often schools must find their own answers to their most puzzling questions; and (f) direction must be guided by overall purpose. According to the commission, the concept of the purpose of education which evolved from the participating schools was that

> the purpose of the school cannot be determined apart from the purposes of the society which maintains the school. The purposes of any society are determined by the life values which the people prize. As a nation we have been striving always for those values which constitute the American way of life. Our people prize individual human personality above everything else. We are convinced that the form of social organization called democracy promotes, better than any other, the development of worth and dignity in men and women. It follows, therefore, that the chief purpose of education in the United States should be to preserve, promote, and refine the way of life in which we as a people believe. (p. 188)

It is interesting to note that following their initial years of study, the commission reports that, "application of principles of democracy to the life of the school would cut deep. To develop a sense of worth in each individual, to promote free participation by each one in the affairs of the school, and to lead everyone to think for himself would demand radical change in many aspects of the curriculum and ways of teaching" (p. 191).

American Youth Commission Survey

The American Youth Commission was appointed by the American Council on Education in 1935 (Raubinger, Rowe, Piper, & West, 1969). A major accomplishment was a survey of a representative sample of thirteen thousand Maryland youth, reported in *Youth Tell Their Story* (American Council on Education, 1938). An extensive case was also made for the generalizability of their findings to all of the United States. The study focused on identifying the needs of youth regarding home, school, work, leisure, and religion. Some of the more important issues set forth, which should be interpreted in the light of an economy emerging from depression were: (a) necessity to equalize educational opportunities as a paramount problem, (b) need to find employment for youth as they leave school, (c) economic security as youth's most urgent personal need, (d) guidance for youth a pressing necessity, (e) lack of appropriate and adequate vocational training, (f) general secondary education in need of serious reorganization, (g) increased leisure time for youth emerging as a significant social problem, (h) need for increased health education, (i) indifference of youth to civil responsibilities, and (j) need for community planning for

youth. Concerning equality of educational opportunity, the report (cited in Raubinger et al., 1969) states, "These are cogent social, as well as political and economic, reasons for making every effort to break up this conspiracy of forces that tends to keep certain groups more or less permanently submerged" (p. 246).

Educational Policies Commission Report

The Educational Policies Commission was established in 1935 jointly by the National Education Association and the American Association of School Administrators. Its purpose was to examine major issues in education and make recommendations for action. Two of the issues initially pressing for solution were financing of public education in light of demand for and trend toward federal participation and control of public education in light of new agencies taking on educational functions. The commission issued many reports, one of which focused on education for *all* American youth. In this report the commission (cited in Raubinger, Rowe, Piper, & West, 1969) states:

> When we write confidently and inclusively about education for all American youth, we mean just that. We mean that all youth, with their human similarities and their equally human differences, shall have educational services and opportunities suited to their personal needs and sufficient for the successful operation of a free and democratic society.... Each of them is a human being, more precious than material goods or systems of philosophy. Not one of them is to be carelessly wasted. All of them are to be given equal opportunities to live and learn. (p. 303)

This report was published in 1944 as World War II was nearing an end. In the report, the commission's description of the issues and analysis are portrayed in the form of two histories of education: *The History That Should Not Happen* and the *History That Must Be Written*. Essentially, the first is a history of the takeover of education by the federal government. The second depicts federal financial aid but retention of state and local control of education by government, teachers associations, and the public. Additionally, the commission developed recommended prototypes for rural and city schools in scenario format entitled "The Farmville Secondary School" and "Schools for Youth in American City."

This report of the commission was summarized by the National Association of Secondary School Principals in 1944. The summary (cited in Raubinger, Rowe, Piper, & West, 1969) features a list of ten "Imperative Educational Needs of Youth," which covered student's need for: (a) salable skills and understandings and attitudes to make workers

intelligent and productive participants in economic life (need supervised occupational experience as well as classroom education); (b) good health, physical fitness, and mental health; (c) understanding of rights and duties of citizens of a democratic society as well as competence to perform these obligations and to have understanding of the nations and peoples of the world; (d) understanding of importance and conditions conducive to successful family life; (e) understanding of how to purchase and use goods and services intelligently; (f) understanding of science; (g) development of the capacity to appreciate beauty; (h) ability to make wise use of leisure; (i) development of respect for others, development of insight into ethical values and principles, and understanding of how to work cooperatively and grow in moral and spiritual values of life; and (j) ability to grow in ability to think rationally, express thoughts clearly and read and listen with understanding (p. 304-305). The emphasis on local initiative in controlling education is evidenced in the closing remarks of the commission (cited in Raubinger et al., 1969) about their Farmville and American City Schools:

> Would you like your children to attend schools like those of Farmville and American City? They can, if you really want them too. Enough is known about how to operate such schools, there is plenty of timber and stone to build them, plenty of wealth to finance them. Your children, your community, your entire state and nation can have schools as good as, or better than, the schools described in this book as soon as you and enough other Americans demand them and do your own special but essential part in bringing them into existence. (p. 351)

1940-1960: Reaction and Subject Centering

Decisions affecting comprehensive high schools during the 1940s and 1950s can be better understood in the context of the larger social and economic developments affecting the United States during this time. These developments include, in rough order, post World War II adjustments to return of service men and women and peace economy; the massive baby boom affecting the schools by 1950; Cold War propaganda and fears giving the country a sense of unifying purpose (and insecurity); and rapid suburbanization and resurgence of individualism. Over time, each of these developments seemed to affect changes in the high school, which did not all resolve themselves by 1960.

By the end of the 1950s there was a persuasive demand for reform of the high school by a return to an academic emphasis, which had supposedly characterized education

before progressivism. But support for this reform was largely absent in the 1940s. Rather, at that time, the thrust was toward better serving those students (estimated to be approximately sixty percent of high school age students) who were not appropriately served by vocational education programs or college preparatory programs. The high school was to perform a *custodial function* for these *marginal* students to keep them off the labor market (where they would be unemployed or compete with adults) and busy (in order to prevent crime and social unrest). The curriculum proposed for this group was entitled *life adjustment* education and focused on the family, child-rearing, spending habits, citizenship, and leisure-time activities (rather than earning a living or preparing for further education). Life adjustment education embodied much of the progressive reforms of the previous forty years. The review of the Commission of Life Adjustment Education for Youth (U.S. Office of Education, 1951) seeks to communicate some of the specifics of this reform.

However, by the early 1950s the tide of public opinion was beginning to be changed by educational critics such as Bestor (1953), Lynd (1953), Hutchins (1953), Smith (1949) and (1954), Bell (1949), and Rickover (1959). The critics, although different in many respects, were similar in characterizing education as aimless, in calling for return to basic academic subjects and mental discipline, and in blaming the education profession, particularly teacher training institutions. In a sense, where earlier reform movements had called for the development of an education profession to take control from the subject matter specialists, the criticism of this period suggested the reverse, with educational control to come from the various disciplines (who better knew what was to be taught).

The press of the Cold War and the Soviet launching of Sputnik in 1957 provided an answer for the question of educational purpose—to compete with totalitarianism, particularly in technical superiority. Even before Sputnik, James B. Conant and Admiral Rickover were concerned about the lack of adequately trained workers for U.S. scientific and defense purposes—this was a renewed focus on vocational efficiency, but now for the vocations of scientists as opposed to skilled craftspersons. Rickover, based on his knowledge of European school systems, called for development of specialized schools to improve the effectiveness of both scientific and technical training. Conant, on the other hand, advocated remaining with the notion of a comprehensive school, but one which operated as an intellectual meritocracy. For him, public schools should abandon their

custodial role and sort out from each generation the most capable (*intelligent*) students and challenge them to their fullest as preparation for political and technical leadership. The comprehensive high school provided a mechanism for the widest possible search for talent yet seemed to meet the democratic value of providing equal educational opportunity. With less emphasis, he also was concerned about providing a good education for those who would need to support the political and technical leaders.

A study by Keller (1955) provides insights into the role of the comprehensive and specialized schools, from the point of view of someone with background and experience in vocational education. Following this review is a brief analysis of one of Conant's (1959) first studies of the high school, entitled *The American High School Today*. The study was well financed, reported in a short, highly readable form, and widely disseminated. Conant's position seemed to stem the tide of criticism of the comprehensive high school (as opposed to specialized schools) and his recommendations were widely adopted as a way to make high schools more purposeful and effective in the social context described earlier.

A large part of Conant's recommendations, and those of the Committee for the White House Conference on Education (1956), also reviewed later, focused on the need to improve the subject matter and process of education. With Sputnik and the Cold War, educational success was tied to national (rather than local) purposes, such as national defense, which led to the position that the federal government was an appropriate source of funds for improving education. Congress passed the National Defense Education Act in 1956, which provided federal support for crash programs in science, mathematics, and foreign languages (even earlier funds for this purpose came from the National Science Foundation).

The emphasis on curriculum revamping and federal support for this purpose led to a number of significant happenings. First, university scholars from disciplines such as physics, mathematics, and biology began to enter the curriculum development business resulting in the *new* math and physics. Second, these were national efforts (rather than previous dependence on local and state educational agencies for curriculum development) involving a lengthy time of development, testing, and teacher training (retraining). Third, emphasis in these new curriculums was on the *discovery method* rather than learning factual information—to learn as a scientist learns was taken to be the best preparation for a future characterized by technological change. Cognitive psychology was growing in

popularity and influence at this time with the work of Piaget, Bruner, and Hunt; application of cognitive psychology suggested that children could learn complex concepts better and earlier than previously thought and that they would be motivated by natural curiosity. In many ways, the discovery approach was similar to that advocated earlier by progressive educators, but its subject matter emphasis had little to do with life adjustment education. Also apparent with the discipline emphasis was lack of concern for the entire impact of the curriculum, how the pieces fit together, and whether it was appropriate for all youth. An emphasis on the earlier concern for producing democratic citizens was noticeably absent. Fourth, the curriculum revisions were expensive and required substantial retraining of teachers. The suburbs were growing very fast during this time; building new schools, were more affluent than inner cities, and because of smaller size, were more easily controlled (changed). This control was coming from a largely upper and middle class group who valued education and dearly wanted an education for their children which would allow them to successfully compete in the modern world. For this reason, the suburbs were often the first to adopt Conant's recommendations and the new curriculums. With these happenings, the seeds were being planted for a major issue of the 1960s and 1970s—inequality of education—receiving its legal impetus with the 1954 Supreme Court Decision of Brown v. Board of Education.

Commission on Life Adjustment Education for Youth

The appointment of the Commission on Life Adjustment Education for Youth by the United States Commissioner of Education was a result of a national conference of educational leaders held in 1947, The National Conference on Life Adjustment Education, which was, in turn, the result of a resolution proposed by Charles A. Prosser at a 1945 Conference on Vocational Education in the Years Ahead. Specifically, Prosser (cited in U.S. Office of Education, 1951) had stated that:

> It is the belief of this conference that, with the aid of this report in final form, the vocational school of a community will be better able to prepare 20 percent of the youth of secondary school age for entrance upon desirable skilled occupations; and that the high school will continue to prepare another 20 percent for entrance to college. We do not believe that the remaining 60 percent of our youth of secondary school age will receive the life adjustment training they need and to which they are entitled as American citizens—unless and until the administration of public education with the assistance of the vocational education leaders formulate a similar program for this group. (p. 15)

This statement (together with another sentence requesting a series of conferences) formed what later became known as the Prosser Resolution.

The basic purpose of the resolution, the resulting regional and national conferences, and the commission, was to increase the effectiveness of schools to meet the needs of all American youth. This purpose was couched in the statistics that a fifth of youth did not enter high school (low participation rate), more than forty percent who entered did not graduate (high dropout rate), many of those who remained in high school were left to engage in activities unrelated to everyday needs of life, and that the baby boom would soon create drastic increases in the high school age group. Less explicit was the post-war labor market context, in which it was believed that youth would have a difficult time finding work. Given the accepted values of providing equality in opportunity to a group not seeming to be served and soon-to-be increasing in number, in the light of labor market needs and college enrollment levels, what were to be the characteristics of an appropriate education for all youth, especially those not seeming to be served by vocational education programs or college preparatory programs? The answer proposed by Prosser and later by educational leaders was *life adjustment education*. It was as if by the 1940s the goal of designing and implementing an educational program preparing a group for college, and another group for immediate employment, was fairly much in place, but that there was still a large group of other youth to be served somehow. Vocational educators and general educators were called upon to form a united effort to work out a mutually accepted solution for an appropriate education for this other group of high school age youth.

The commission on Life Adjustment Education defined *life adjustment education* "as that which better equips all American youth to live democratically with satisfaction to themselves and profit to society as home members, workers and citizens" (U.S. Office of Education, 1951, p. 4). Many of the ideas of the Commission were drawn from earlier studies of the high schools in America (such as those reviewed in this report); the emphasis of this commission was to move these ideas to the point of action through its leadership. A common understanding agreed to by Commission members was that, "Life itself and realistic experiences must increasingly become the basic criterion, if all youth of high school age are to derive maximum benefits from high school" (p. 54). Accordingly, the implications of this position were spelled out under the following headings: (a) "Guidance and Pupil Personnel Services," (b) "Ethical and Moral Living," (c) "Citizenship

Education," (d) "Home and Family Life," (e) "Self-Realization and Use of Leisure," (f) "Health and Safety," (g) "Consumer Education," (h) "Tools of Learning," (i) "Work Experience, Occupational Adjustment, and Competencies," and (j) "Administrative, Financial and Organizational Arrangements." (p. ii) The *general education* curriculum emerged. To implement these recommendations, the Commission felt two things were essential: (a) recognition of the problem of unserved youth by the general public, and (b) a decision by high school faculty to make the best use of available resources to deal with the problem.

Committee for the White House Conference on Education

In 1954 President Eisenhower asked the governors of the fifty three states and territories to join him in making the "most thorough, widespread, and concerted study the American people have ever made of their educational problems" (Committee for the White House Conference on Education, 1956, p. 1). The study report, published in 1956, describes the results of the National Conference and state conferences held in every state. An estimated one half million persons, representing a cross section of the population, was involved in the various sectional, state, and national conferences. Two thousand delegates, about one-third from education, met for five days in Washington, D.C. for the National Conference in November, 1965. The six topics forming the agenda for the conference were

1. What should our schools accomplish?
2. In what ways can we organize our school systems more efficiently and economically?
3. What are our school building needs?
4. How can we get enough good teachers—and keep them?
5. How can we finance our schools—build and operate them? and
6. How can we obtain a continuing public interest in education?

Separate subcommittees worked on each of these questions.

Using input from the subcommittees plus the reports of state conferences and other sub-studies, the Committee formulated a set of summary recommendations, which highlight the following positions: (a) school authorities should emphasize the importance of priorities in education (but little was suggested specifically about what should get priority except education for all need not be inconsistent with providing full opportunity for the gifted and that overspecialization of vocational education should be avoided); (b) careful study of school organization to avoid waste of funds (e.g., many small school districts, need for decentralization of large city schools); (c) quick assessment of school building needs (e.g., many buildings in poor condition, many new classrooms need to serve the baby boom); (d) greater inducements of all kinds to attract and retain enough good teachers and efforts to use teachers time more effectively; (e) new look at how much money is spent on education (e.g., should come from all three levels of government, within next decade, amount should be doubled); (f) take steps to encourage interest and activity of all citizens in school affairs (e.g., citizen advisory groups, parent and teacher organizations; because only the public can create good schools and nurture them); and (g) holding a White House Conference on Higher Education.

The first sentence of the committee report concludes that from the work of the committee, "one fundamental fact emerges: schools now affect the welfare of the United States more than ever before in history, and this new importance of education has been dangerously underestimated for a long time" (p. 7). Reasons suggested for the impatience are that an uneducated populace is a greater handicap to a nation with each passing generation and as an instrument for keeping the nation a land of opportunity. The report states that, "the schools stand as the chief expression of the American tradition of fair play for everyone, and a fresh start for each generation" (p. 4). And later in the section on what schools should accomplish, "The schools have become a major tool for creating a Nation without rigid class barriers. It is primarily the schools which allow no man's failure to prevent the success of his son" (p. 9). The ability of education to give this "fresh start" to each generation was attributed to a broadening concept of education. In characterizing this concept for the future, the committee states:

> It is no longer thought proper to restrict educational programs to the skills of the mind, even though these skills remain of fundamental importance. Schools also attempt to improve children's health, to provide vocational training, and to do anything else which will help bring a child up to the starting line of adult life as even with his contemporaries as native differences in ability permit. The most practical aspect of this new concept

> of education is that it calls for the most careful mining and refining of all human talents in the land—it is in itself a kind of law against waste. (p. 5)

These would be haunting words in the next decades.

1954 Supreme Court Decision

While education, in general, was expanding its purposes and aiming to better serve its students by endorsing the concept of life adjustment education, the Supreme Court made a major decision that was to have delayed, but substantial effects on the comprehensive high school. On May 17, 1954, the court made a unanimous decision delivered by Chief Justice Warren (cited in Tanner, 1972) in stating:

> We conclude that in the field of public education the doctrine of `separate but equal' has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal. Therefore we hold that the plaintiffs and others similarly situated for whom the actions have been brought are, by reason of the segregation complained of, deprived of the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment. (p. 78)

The reasoning of the court concerning the effects of segregation was explained as follows:

> Today, education is perhaps the most important function of state and local governments . . . . It is the very foundation of good citizenship.... In these days, it is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of an education. Such an opportunity where the state has undertaken to provide it, is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms . . . . To separate them from others of similar age and qualifications solely because of their race generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone. (Tanner, 1972, p. 78)

While this ruling struck down dejure segregation as existed largely in the South where separate schools were provided, still remaining for attention was defacto segregation as existed in the North, where schools were segregated largely because of geographic separation caused by community housing restrictions and concentration of lower socio-economic groups in slums and low income housing projects.

The Comprehensive High School

The Comprehensive High School by Franklin J. Keller (1955) was chosen for review here because it was the only book able to be identified which had a title referring directly to the comprehensive school during the 1940-50 time period. Keller wrote it while on sabbatical from the New York Public Schools, where he was principal of the Metropolitan Vocational High School. He was also the author of *The Double-Purpose High School* (1953) and *Principles of Vocational Education* (1948). The study reported in *The Comprehensive High School*, based on visits to seventy seven high schools across the United States, raises many of the issues facing the idea of the comprehensive high school during this time, particularly as they relate to vocational education.

The key question directing this study of American high schools was, "What kind of educational organization will give our children the kind of education they ought to have?" (Keller, 1955, pp. xiv-xv). All through the study, Keller seems to be raising the issue of whether democracy requires uniformity or sameness, especially in high school organization and the curriculum available to each student. He makes the point that different students do have different (occupational) aspirations and there is no reason to evade recognition of this fact, and ultimately there is nothing undemocratic about this diversity. His focus on this issue seems to raise the importance of coming to grips with the meaning of the concept *democracy* as important to sorting out the purpose and means of the comprehensive high school.

Keller posited a series of questions about comprehensive high schools that served to guide his investigation; these questions also serve to pinpoint explicitly some of the issues facing the idea of a comprehensive school during this time period. The questions raised were as follows:

1. What is a comprehensive school? An entity based on philosophy of education or type of organization. Should one seek perfect model and then evaluate others on this basis or search for drives that impel aim for comprehensiveness?

2. What is relation of comprehensiveness to the size and composition of the community? Is comprehensive school only possible and efficient in small community?

3. What is relation in terms of value and status of *knowing* subjects to "doing" subjects in the comprehensive high school? Do most comprehensive schools develop from academic status by vocational accretions?

4. If we learn by doing, is *doing* to be purposeful, socially gainful, and personally beneficial or only doing for activity's sake?

5. Conceding that education for an occupation must be given at some time in life of the pupil, should it be postponed until just before the pupil enters that occupation, or should it begin as soon as any interest in life activity becomes discernible in the child?

6. What are we going to do about prejudice against vocational education? About the low opinion of manual labor? Are and should vocational education classes be repositories for the dull and troublesome?

7. What can we do to promote and get recognition for dynamic leadership in the *doing* phase of education?

8. How are we to reduce the waste in high school education? In the use of students time and school financial resources?

9. To what extent are school systems trying to find out how effective their high schools are?

10. What proportion of high school graduates (and dropouts) later become employers? How to get their support?

11. How is guidance in the high school to become real, dynamic, and truly functional? Are there varieties of intelligence rather than one?

12. How can we get the high schools to understand what vocational education really is, what industrial arts really is, what work experience really is, what cooperative education really is (not *merely* quibbling over words but a *grand* quibbling)?

13. What kind of job can a comprehensive school really do? Does it depend on things the school comprises, the wideness of its scope, and its inclusiveness of community resources? (Keller, 1955)

As a result of his investigations, Keller concludes by defining a comprehensive high school as one which

> aims to serve the needs of all American youth. That is today it accepts without selection all the young people in the area it commands—all races, creeds, nationalities, intelligences, talents, and all levels of wealth and social status. Such a school has as its broadest objective the teaching of all varieties of skill, all kinds of knowledge to all kinds of youth bent upon living socially profitable lives. To each one it seeks to give the course for which he seems best fitted. Its design is to prepare one and all for potentially successful vocations. The comprehensive high school prepares the college-oriented youth for college. It qualifies the non-college-bound youth and, as far as possible, the boy or girl who will drop out before

> graduation for an occupation. It is adapted to give everyone a general education for the common things he will do in life and it may and should give some pupils of high capacity preparation for both college and occupation. (pp. 31-32)

He goes on to enumerate nineteen characteristics of good comprehensive schools. For example, two of the characteristics are: (a) all pupils, regardless of their major subjects or postgraduate plans, must intermingle in the academic classes and in all extra-curricular activities, without restriction; and (b) the principal must have had vocational experience or an intimate vocational background.

On the questions related to the issue of advocating comprehensive versus specialized schools, Keller first portrayed the typical historical development of present day high schools as follows: (a) development of elementary school, (b) development of academic high school, (c) add agriculture and home economics classes, (d) add diversified occupations (business) classes, (e) add industrial arts classes, (f) add more shops, and (g) decision to build another school—should it be another *comprehensive* school or a specialized vocational school?

Keller's answer to this last question is, "the carefully planned comprehensive high school is an adequate educational instrument for the one high school community, but, as the community grows into what is likely to be a great city, it must specialize—wisely and well" (p. 38). The reasoning is that effective and efficient occupational preparation requires the class time, teaching expertise and extensive facilities made possible by specialization. Specialized schools also provide the potential for conveying to students a high value and status to vocational education; for as Keller suggests, "vocational education conceived in prejudice and born with stigma is a vain thing. It engenders hate. It denies democracy. It mocks education" (p. 263). These are factors which promote the attainment of democratic ideals as much as or more than being housed together under the same high school roof.

The American High School Today: A First Report to Interested Citizens

The American High School Today, published in 1959, was authored by James B. Conant, who had been President of Harvard University from 1933 to 1953. The book was financed by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York to Educational Testing Service, who employed Conant to conduct the study. It is included here in preference to other books with similar titles because it specifically focused on the comprehensive high

school in contrast to specialized high schools, and because of its subsequent wide visibility and influence. Conant used as his definition of the comprehensive high school one that was proposed by (then) President of Carnegie Corporation, John Gardner (cited in Conant, 1959), who defined it as

> a particularly American phenomenon. It is called comprehensive because it offers, under one administration and under one roof (or series of roofs), secondary education for almost all the high school age children of one town or neighborhood. It is responsible for educating the boy who will be an atomic scientist and the girl who will marry at eighteen; the prospective captain of a ship and the future captain of industry. It is responsible for educating the bright and not so bright children with different vocational and professional ambitions and with various motivations. It is responsible in sum, for providing good and appropriate education, both academic and vocational, for all young people within a democratic environment which the American people believe serves the principles they cherish. (p. ix)

Conant concluded that the idea of a comprehensive high school "has come into being because of our economic history and our devotion to the ideals of equality of opportunity and equality of status" (Conant, 1959, p. 7). The *twin* ideals of equality of opportunity and status were defined as an equal start in a competitive struggle and equal status of all honest labor, respectively.

Following the intent of Gardner's definition, Conant lists three main objectives of a comprehensive high school as being, "first, to provide a general education for all future citizens; second, to provide good elective programs for those who wish to use their acquired skills immediately on graduation; third, to provide satisfactory programs for those whose vocation will depend on their subsequent education in a college or university" (p. 17). The major purpose of Conant's study was to answer the question: Is it possible to fulfill these three functions under one roof and under the same management? His study came at a time when there was considerable questioning of the feasibility of the comprehensive school notion and serious motion to remain with present and to develop new specialized high schools (i.e., separate vocational and college preparatory schools).

The results of Conant's study are based on visits and data collected from fifty five high schools in eighteen states. During the process of analysis, a fifteen-point checklist of criteria was created to assist in identifying comprehensive schools. Using the criteria Conant suggested it was more appropriate to think in terms of "degrees of comprehensiveness." Major areas of the checklist items were: (a) adequacy of general education for all (e.g., offerings in English and American literature and composition, ability

grouping in required courses); (b) adequacy in academic elective programs (e.g., vocational programs for boys and commercial programs for girls, opportunities for supervised work experience); (c) special arrangements for academically talented students (e.g., special provisions for challenging the highly gifted, such as summer sessions from which able students may profit); (d) other features (e.g., adequacy of the guidance service, well organized homerooms).

Conant's conclusions were that the United States should reduce the number of small high schools where at least a limited degree of comprehensiveness was not possible and, most telling, that no other radical alteration of the structure of the American high school was necessary—we should remain with the goal of having comprehensive high schools. He developed twenty one specific recommendations which, taken together, outline the important characteristics of a satisfactory high school which is *widely comprehensive*. These recommendations refer to areas such as: the counseling system, individualized programs, required programs for all, ability grouping, English composition, diversified programs for the development of marketable skills, special consideration for very slow learners and highly gifted pupils, and organization of the school day. In making changes toward making high schools even more comprehensive, he suggested using the bootstrap method of adapting the best from that which has been well tried and tested, all within the recognition that there is great diversity in American high schools—meaning there is a need to consider the local situation in order to finally see what is appropriate.

1960-1980: Relevance/Equity

A major concern of the 1960s and 1970s was with using education as a tool to provide equal opportunity for young people in the United States. Schools were to attack the problems of poverty and racial and ethnic discrimination. Where in the later 1950s the schools were used to fight Eisenhower's Cold War, in the 1960s it was Johnson's War on Poverty. Even with this new thrust, however, the attempts at curriculum revision and focus on intellectual capabilities initiated in the 1950s came into being.

In 1967, James Conant authored another study of the American high school, entitled *The Comprehensive High School.* In contrast to his earlier study of the high school in 1959, which was based largely on school visitation and interview, this study was

designed around a questionnaire survey of two thousand comprehensive high schools of medium size. In general, he concludes that for an excellent comprehensive high school, one needs an enrollment of at least seven hundred fifty students and sufficient funds. Further, he emphasizes the great differences among schools and variations between states. The American ideal of equal educational opportunity was far from being realized. In keeping with his earlier ideas, he suggested that the comprehensive high school should attempt to achieve the ends of endeavoring, "to provide a general education for all future citizens on the basis of a common democratic understanding; and it seeks to provide in its selective offerings excellent instruction in academic fields and rewarding first class vocational education" (Conant, 1967, p. 4). The major advantage of the comprehensive school (over specialized and selective school) was in providing an opportunity for "students from different backgrounds to learn how to get on with one another" (p. 6). One of the important questions addressed was how wide an offering was necessary by a comprehensive school to do justice to the desires and potentialities of all its students. Conant concluded:

> [A] widely comprehensive high school should as a minimum meet the following criteria: (a) provide instruction in calculus; (b) provide instruction in a modern foreign language for four years; (c) arrange the schedules so that a student may study in any one year English, mathematics, science, a foreign language, social studies, physical education, art or music, (d) provide one or more advanced placement courses, and (e) have enough English teachers so that `the average pupil load' is 120 or less. (p. 16)

He distinguished between *ability grouping* (where students might be segregated for a single subject) and *tracking* where students are in some way segregated for all classes. The real working of a comprehensive high school was made possible by its electives and effective counseling.

Concerning vocational education, Conant was concerned with the high school having a diversity of offerings; he concluded that instruction in vocational education did not interfere with instruction in advanced academic fields. For him the alternatives to providing vocational education in the comprehensive high school were to develop specialized vocational high schools, or to delay it to the post secondary level of education. He concludes, "My inclination is strongly in favor of including vocational work in a comprehensive high school instead of providing it in a separate high school. My reasons are largely social rather than educational" (p. 62). Those reasons were similar to those

given in his earlier study, namely the opportunity for mixing students from different backgrounds.

Conant felt that the main reason for not requiring academically talented programs for everyone was that there were a large number who were unwilling or unable to do the work. His hope was that in the future, with advances in educational technology, the distinction of *academically talented* might largely disappear because it would be possible to have students learn at the same rate and motivation. Then more efforts could be devoted to the social ideals of the comprehensive high school and, thereby, reduce the degree of misunderstanding and prejudice among students.

In some ways, the curriculum revisions and intellectual focus of the early 1960s precipitated the concern for equal opportunity because the revisions were implemented in uneven ways (largely in the suburbs) and were to be criticized for producing an irrelevant curriculum for the average and below average student. A considerable sized group of people were being bypassed of the benefits from the educational reforms. Contrary to what Conant had suggested, research was showing that education, as it then existed, was not redistributing socioeconomic status with each generation, but that poverty was being passed on from grandparent to parent to child—a rather stable culture of poverty existed.

This point was driven home by the large amount of publicity given to massive riots in Harlem (1964), Watts (1965), and Detroit (1967). Social leaders talked of a social dynamite existing in low income urban areas. Schools were enlisted and took leadership in suggesting that education could break the poverty cycle. Educationists again came to prominence, emphasizing a shift of emphasis from subject matter to the learner and their learning problems as opposed to the discipline oriented subject matter specialists, who had advocated and worked on the earlier curriculum revisions So too, more emphasis was placed on teaching marketable skills, since many of the students to be served were not likely to be going on to college. With this shift in direction, there was passage of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and the Amendments of 1968 and 1976 with much more focus on target populations, special needs learners, and provision of equality of opportunity. Also coming into existence were the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, which provided for the Office of Economic Opportunity (separate from the Office of Education) and its education related programs of Upward Bound, Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, and Head Start. In 1965 there came the Elementary and

Secondary Act, providing massive financial assistance to local schools for "compensatory education" to expand and improve their educational programs for deprived students.

The concept of equality of opportunity was shifting from that of providing equal inputs (e.g. teachers, facilities) to that of obtaining equal results, which required compensating for earlier learning deprivations by providing *extra* inputs for some groups. The legitimacy of this change was documented by Coleman (1966) and others in their landmark study, *Equality of Educational Opportunity.*

The Coleman Study, as it came to be known, was mandated by the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (cited in Coleman, 1966) with a charge:

> The Commissioner shall conduct a survey and make a report to the President and the Congress, within two years of the enactment of this title, concerning the lack of availability of equal educational opportunities for individuals by reason of race, color, religion or national origin in public educational institutions at all levels in the United States, its territories and possessions, and the District of Columbia. (p. iii)

Six racial groups were given attention: Negroes, American Indians, Oriental Americans, Puerto Ricans, Mexican Americans, and Whites. The four major study or "topics" were: (a) the extent to which racial and ethnic groups are segregated in public schools, (b) whether the schools offer good educational opportunities, (c) how much the students learn in terms of standardized achievement tests, and (d) possible relationships between students' achievement and the kind of schools they attend. Study design involved a large survey of 4,000 public schools and 645,000 questionnaires (575,000 students, 68,000 teachers, and 4,000 principals) and a series of sub-studies at a total cost of three million dollars. No recommendations were made, but the study findings in response to each of the four basic questions were: (a) segregation in public schools—"the great majority of American children attend schools that are segregated" (Coleman, 1966, p. 3); using the "yardstick" held by the 1954 U.S. Supreme Court decision that separate schools for Negroes are inherently unequal, "American public education remains largely unequal in most regions of the country" (Coleman, 1966, p. 3); (b) schools and their characteristics—Negro pupils attend schools with poorer facilities, lower quality programs, less qualified principals and teachers and a student body composed/drawn from a more restricted and lower socio-economic group; (c) achievement of schools—most minority group pupils scored distinctly below white pupils at same grade level; gap in scores widened between grade one and

twelve; (d) relation of achievement to school characteristics—after controlling for socio-economic status, differences in schools account for only a small fraction of difference in pupil achievement; within this small effect by schools, improving the schools of minority pupils will raise achievement more than for whites; factors with strongest effects were quality of teachers and the educational background and aspirations of other students in the school. It is this latter finding which drew most attention—that differences in school achievement was largely not tied to school inputs but rather the socio-economic status of the students with whom poor children attended school. Racial and social class integration was implied as the most viable solution to assisting the young to escape poverty.

In the face of these findings and the call for action by minority groups, Church and Sedlock (1976, pp. 754-768) classify educator's responses during this period, in seeking to keep their promise of helping to eliminate poverty in these categories: (a) compensatory education; (b) making the school curriculum more relevant to ghetto children (e.g., English as second language, black studies); (c) recruiting teachers from backgrounds similar to children having difficulty; (d) integration requirements (i.e., establishing an artificial condition of racial mixture which did not exist naturally, through, for example, busing); and (e) movement for community control of school (e.g., decentralization, model cities). The major evaluation of these efforts implied that these *new* school efforts did not substantially reverse the effects of poverty, even though they had some effects. By the early 1970s there was a mounting sense of frustration and defeatism among educators and disappointment and anger among parents and taxpayers. With this frustration and disappointment came such varied responses as *quick fixes* like *performance contracting*, excuses like entertaining Jensen's (1969) work on the inherently inferior learning capacity of blacks or Jenck's (1972) idea of the importance of *luck* and need for more direct solution by income transfer, and last, the widespread call for evaluation, accountability, and eventually, *back to the basics*. Citizens were becoming more distrustful of government during this time of the Vietnam War and Watergate.

In 1970, Silberman's *Crisis in the Classroom*, a study financed by the Carnegie Corporation, was published. It called for humanizing of the school to make it more interesting and exciting; terms such as *the open school*, *open classrooms*, and *learning center* were introduced to the educational scene. Silberman suggested allowing more freedom in the schools by reducing the number of required courses, allowing more

independent study, encouraging offering more electives, and permitting the fulfillment of some course requirements outside of the classroom (Silberman, 1970).

But, later in the 1970s, the message communicated by national study commissions was beginning to change, particularly regarding comprehensive high schools. In 1973, the National Commission on the Reform of Secondary Education established by the Kettering Foundation described a future context for high schools consisting of an end to extraordinary expansion of facilities and student numbers (with the passing of the baby boom), a surplus of teachers, completion of a decade (the 60s) of innovation with little results, and high schools in crisis because of decreasing attendance rates, declining achievement in urban schools, and increased crime in the schools. A major change recommended by the Commission was that "recognition be given to a wide variety of available alternatives" to the traditional high school (National Commission on the Reform of Secondary Education, 1973, p. 11). These alternatives, which included art museums, studios, job apprenticeship programs, libraries, zoos and so forth, "offer a number of avenues by which learners may pursue secondary education based upon individual interests and objectives" (p. 11). The Commission concluded that these alternative paths to the diploma may mean that only about seventy percent of the student population would graduate from conventional comprehensive high schools. Some later cautioned that this would mean a shift from the ideals of the comprehensive high school to that of specialized schools (Tanner, 1982).

The commission's assessment of reality in the high school at that time was that, "The American comprehensive high school today must be viewed as an establishment striving to meet the complex demands of a society in the times of social change, at a time when the school system has become too large as an institution and is literally overrun with a mix of young people from inconsistent social backgrounds" (National Commission on the Reform of Secondary Education, 1973, p. 10). The Commission made thirty-two recommendations with the following headings: "Defining School Expectations," "Community Participation in Determining Secondary School Expectations," "Basis for Curricular Revision" (no longer to perform a custodial function), "Teacher Training," "Bias in Textbooks" (ethnic groups and women), "Bias in Counseling," "Affirmative Action," "Expanding Career Opportunities," (wider range of occupations), "Career Education," "Job Placement" (employment office in school), "Global Education," "Alternative Paths to High School Completion," "Local Board Responsibilities for Funding Alternatives," "Credit for

Experience" (outside of school), "Secondary Level Examination Program," "Broadcast Television," "Classroom Use of Broadcast Materials," "Cable Television," "Flexibility of Alternative Programs" (move away from Carnegie Unit), "Rank in Class" (no longer use), "Planning for School Security," "Records of Violence," "Code of Student Rights and Obligations," "School Newspapers, Right of Privacy" (for student records), "Corporal Punishment" (outlaw), "Student Activities" (available to all), "Compulsory Attendance" (drop school leaving age to fourteen), "Free K-14 Public Education" (last six years available to use anytime in life), "Youth Organizations," "Sexism" (eliminate), and "Females in Competitive Team Sports" (equal opportunity) (National Commission on the Reform of Secondary Education, 1973).

Also in 1974, the Panel on Youth of the President's Science Advisory Committee, chaired by James Coleman, issued its report entitled *Youth: Transition to Adulthood.* Coleman (1974) introduces the report with the statement, "As the labor of children has become unnecessary to society, school has been extended for them. With every decade, the length of schooling has increased, until a thoughtful person must ask whether society can conceive of no other way for youth to come into adulthood" (p. xiii). He further suggests that schools have expanded to fill the time once occupied by other activities (such as work) which provided young persons, "opportunities for responsible action, situations in which one came to have authority over matters that affected other persons, occasions in which he experienced the consequences of his own actions, and was strengthened by facing them—in short, all that is implied by `becoming adult' in matters other than gaining cognitive skills" (p. xiii).

The report summary begins by concluding that the dominant institutions for youth at present are high schools and colleges. The panel's recommendations are set within a premise that it is time for society's treatment of youth to include school but neither be defined nor limited to it; further, that this broader environment in which youth make a transition to adulthood have two sets of objectives, "self-centered objectives of acquiring skills and knowledge; and objectives relating to responsibilities affecting other persons" (p. xv).

Recommendations for change are in the form of pilot programs, which can be expanded after testing. The recommendations include: (a) development of more specialized high schools as distinct from comprehensive ones and reduction in size of

schools—also encouragement of students teaching younger children and schools placing youth in settings outside the school concurrent with continued schooling; (b) encouragement of mixture of part time work and part time school; (c) more intimate intermixture of school and work carried out at the workplace; (d) federal government to serve as paying customer for youth organizations to give financial base and purpose and for set up of youth communities where they provide services and have responsibility; (e) review of protection regulations for workers under 18 (with purpose of relaxing them) and development of a dual minimum wage (lower for young workers); (f) introduction of broadly-usable educational vouchers from age sixteen equivalent to value of cost of four years of college (use any time); (g) a wider range of opportunities for public service by youth; and (h) a series of questions requiring further research (e.g., cost and returns of part-time work to academic achievement, benefits and costs of interrupted schooling) (Panel on Youth of the President's Science Advisory Committee, 1974).

In support for its recommendation for more specialized schools, the Panel on Youth states:

> This proposal goes directly against the trends in American education toward comprehensive schools. The specialized schools of the past were eliminated in one community after another.... Comprehensive schools seemed to have advantages of mixing students, allowing easy transfer from one curriculum to another, and in general, providing a democratic equality of opportunity and treatment. But these supposed advantages have been negated in many locales. Comprehensive schools drawing from black lower class neighborhoods or white upper middle class areas are very different. By specializing overtly in student body, they specialize covertly in curriculum. The comprehensive school becomes a narrow school, vainly trying to be like others, but passively specializing around neighborhood input. (p. 153)

Where the advantages have been lost, the panel recommends a move to specialized schools, which have the advantage of allowing

> greater encouragement of intense concentration on an activity. . . . Specialized schools have a clearer mission, they can build organizational competence and identity around their more restricted focus, and they can attract students and faculty of appropriate and mutually-reinforcing interest. For example, they can concentrate on excellence in music, arts, performing arts, science, humanistic studies or different industry sectors . . . . And there are other advantages. A school specializing in one major area of study can draw students from a larger geographic area, helping to attenuate the existing specialization by narrowing geographic base that commits all neighborhood youth to the one public school. Such a school can set

admission policies that encourage representatives from various social groups. (p. 153)

In 1976, the National Panel on High Schools and Adolescent Education established by the U.S. Office of Education issued a report entitled *The Education of Adolescents*. In the introduction, the chairperson states, "An essential feature of the report... is the conviction that the high school has become over burdened and should share its responsibilities for youth with other agencies in the community, so that instruction and educational experiences can be provided both in the school and outside the school in the community itself" (p. viii). The panel begins its report with a series of observations that serve as context and rationale for its recommendations. The observations recognize the monumental task of providing universal schooling for all adolescents, the increasing separation of teenagers from adults, younger age of onset of puberty, a heterogeneity of adolescence that is greater than present high school can encompass, lack of sufficient education for citizenship, high public support for vocational education, increasing responsibility given to school for education and redress of society's ills, and need for managers of change in governance of schools. The panel suggests these observations can best be summarized by seeing them

> as leading to a call for comprehensive education through complimentary arrangements and linkages among many organizations *including* schools. The panel would shift the emphasis away from the *comprehensive school* toward *comprehensive education*, arguing that the confines of one building are no longer enough to contain all the valuable and necessary experiences for today's young person. (p. 8)

Major recommendations of the panel were: (a) the unattainable practice and inadequate concept of the comprehensive high school be replaced with the more practical goal of providing comprehensive education through a variety of means including the schools; (b) inaugurate *participatory education* for joint participation of adolescents and interested and qualified adults, especially in the areas of education in the arts, vocational education and education in the operation of government; (c) establishment of small, flexible, short-term part-time schools; (d) reduce compulsory daily attendance from all-day sessions to an academic day of two to four hours; (e) reemphasize the basic role of the high school as education of the intellect; (f) establish community guidance centers; (g) test these recommendations on small scale with careful monitoring; (h) recognize importance of adult and adolescent participation in educational change; (i) federally sponsored research; (j)

federal support and state review of these changes; (k) establish operational planning teams at local level.

Completing the 1970s, the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education published its report entitled *Giving Youth A Better Chance* in 1979. The major concerns of the study group were: (a) reducing dropouts and absenteeism in high school, (b) improving basic skills of high school graduates, (c) giving high school students an opportunity to develop useful work habits, (d) reducing the alienating aspects of the high school experience, (e) easing the transaction from high school to the labor market, (f) improving the paths into higher education, (g) improving the paths into military service, and (h) creating many more opportunities for other forms of service by youth (p. 15).

Starting with a general recommendation that the age of free choice to leave school be made age sixteen, other high priority recommendations were grouped into categories of the high school, post secondary, labor market, service, and community. Referring only to those specifically focused on the high school, the recommendations included: (a) change the basic structure of high schools by making them smaller or by creating diversity within them or both, by creating full-time specialty schools, by creating part-time specialty schools, and by providing one or two days a week for education-related work and/or service; (b) create work and service opportunities for students through the facilities of the high school; (c) stop the tracking of students (all individualized programs); (d) put applied skills training in private shops (with the exception of clerical skills and home economics), when not moved to post secondary level (basic vocational skills for high school are skills in literacy and numeracy and good work habits); (e) finance needy students through work study programs and more effective job placement; (f) create job preparation and placement centers in high school (follow students for two years after their leaving school); (g) improve capacity to teach basic skills through more federal funding; (h) encourage earlier entry from high school into college; and (i) experiment with vouchers and greater freedom of choice in public schools.

1980- : Return to Basics/Excellence

Perhaps it would be best to begin this section with review of a very critical response to the critique of comprehensive high schools evident in the four national studies just

reviewed in the previous section. Such a response was provided by Daniel Tanner in *Educational Leadership* (1982). First, he reminded readers of the observations of Dewey in 1915 and the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education in 1918 concerning splitting the secondary school system. Dewey (cited in Tanner, 1982) gave this advice:

> The segregation proposed is to divide the children of the more well-to-do and cultured families of the community from those children who will presumably earn their living by working for wages in manual and commercial employment.... Many of us have been disturbed at the increasing tendency toward stratification of classes in this country. We have wondered if those European prophets were correct who have insistently foretold that the development of fixed classes in this country was only a question of time. Few would have dreamed that the day was already at hand when responsible and influential persons would urge that the public school system should recognize the separation as an accomplished fact, and adapt to its machinery of administrative control its courses of study, and its methods of instruction in public schools. (p. 610)

The Commission on Reorganization, (cited in Tanner, 1982) stated:

> The comprehensive high school embracing all curriculums in one unified organization, should remain the standard type of secondary school in the United States... the comprehensive school is the prototype of a democracy in which various groups must have a degree of self-consciousness as groups and yet be federated into a larger whole through the recognition of common interests and ideals. (p. 611)

From here, Tanner makes his most provocative remarks:

> Where the 1918 commission envisioned the serving of all youth in our high schools as an opportunity and responsibility, the contemporary commissions and panels choose to see it as a 'burden.' Where the 1918 Commission viewed our societal strength as derived from unity through diversity, the contemporary commissions and panels choose to see such diversity only in terms of incompatibility and conflict. Where the 1918 commission looked to youth as the rising generation in whose hands would be the future of the nation, the contemporary commissions and panels portray this generation as the "youth problem." Where the 1918 commission recognized the unique and democratizing function of public secondary education, the contemporary commissions and panels favor the surrender of the public interest to the private interests of business, industry, and the media. (Tanner, 1982, p. 611)

In the same vein as the later 1970s, the 1980s were also fortunate or vexed, depending on how you look at it, with yet more national studies focusing on educational reform with implications for comprehensive high schools. Three of these studies issued early reports in the 1980s.

In 1982, a group of scholars known as the Paideia Group, funded by the MacArthur Foundation and chaired by Mortimer Adler, published its report entitled *The Paideia Proposal, An Educational Manifesto*. (*Paideia* refers to the general learning that should be the possession of all human beings). Again drawing on the thoughts of Dewey and also Horace Mann, Adler states:

> The Democratic promise of equal educational opportunity, half fulfilled, is worse than a promise broken. It is an ideal betrayed. Equality of educational opportunity is not, in fact, provided if it means no more than taking all children into the public schools for the same number of hours, days, and years. If once they are divided into the sheep and the goats, into those destined solely for toil and those destined for economic and political leadership and for a quality of life to which all should have access, then the democratic purpose has been undermined by an inadequate system of public schooling . . . . It fails because it has achieved only the same quantity of public schooling, not the same quality . . . . We should . . . be an educationally classless society. (Adler, 1982, p. 5)

For the Paideia Group, true equality of educational conditions is when every student gets the same quality education; in the words of Robert Hutchins, "The best education for the best is the best education for all" (Hutchins as cited in Adler, 1982, p. 6). They propose a one track system of public schools that has the same objectives for all youth: "to earn a living in an intelligent and responsible fashion, to function as intelligent and responsible citizens and to make both of these things serve the purpose of leading intelligent and responsible lives—to enjoy as fully as possible all the goods that make a human life as good as it can be" (Adler, 1982, p. 18). To achieve these goals, education, according to them, must be general and liberal (nonspecialized and nonvocational) for the first twelve years. Vocational education, in the sense of preparing for particular jobs, is designated as something educators turned to for the "portion of the school population which they incorrectly and unjustly appraised as being uneducable—only trainable" (p. 19). Twelve years of general, unspecialized schooling is suggested to be the best preparation for work. In keeping with the notion of equality of education for all, the Group recommends a common curriculum, with all courses required by all (except choice of a second language) and no electives.

In 1983, President Reagan's National Commission on Excellence in Education issued its report, largely focused on the high school, entitled *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform.* The commission introduced its report with:

> Our nation is at risk. Our once unchallenged preeminence in commerce, industry, science, and technological innovation is being overtaken by competitors throughout the world . . . the educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a Nation and a people . . . . If an unfriendly power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre educational performance that exists today, we might well have viewed it as an act of war . . . . We have been committing an act of unthinking, unilateral educational disarmament. Our society and its educational institutions seem to have lost sight of the basic purposes of schooling, and of the high expectations and disciplined effort needed to attain them. (pp. 5-6)

The commission recommended a renewed commitment to excellence in education, which means individuals performing at the boundaries of their abilities, and schools setting high expectations. However, the Commission believed that commitment to excellence does *not* have to be at the expense of a strong commitment to the equitable treatment of diverse populations. "The twin goals of equity and high-quality schooling have profound and practical meaning for our economy and society, and we cannot permit one to yield to the other either in principle or in practice" (p. 13).

Findings and recommendations of the commission are categorized in the areas of content, expectations, time, and teaching. Regarding content, one of the commission's findings was that secondary school curriculums have become "homogenized, diluted, and diffuse to the point that they no longer have a central purpose. In effect, we have a cafeteria style curriculum in which the appetizers and desserts can easily be mistaken for the main courses. Students have migrated from vocational and college preparatory programs to `general track' courses in large numbers" (p. 18). Recommendations of the commission addressed the following: (a) strengthening of high school graduation requirements (particularly five *new* basics—English, mathematics, science, social studies, and computer science; foreign language for college bound); (b) raising of expectations for academic performance and conduct in schools and admission standards for college; (c) spending more time on new basics (e.g., more effective use of school day, longer school day, lengthened school year); (d) improve preparation of teachers and make teaching a more rewarding and respected profession (e.g., increase salaries, longer contracts, provision for

master teachers); (e) holding educators and elected officials responsible for these changes, and having citizens provide fiscal support and stability to bring about these changes.

Within days after the release of *A Nation at Risk*, the Twentieth Century Fund-sponsored report of its Task Force on Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Policy was released (in preliminary form). Again there was concern about too many young people leaving school without essential learning skills and without self discipline and purpose.

The Task Force called for national commitment to excellence in public schools and, at a minimum, provision of the same core curriculum components to all students. The core components are, "basic skills in reading, writing, and calculating; technical capability in computers; training in science and foreign languages; and knowledge of civics" (Twentieth Century Fund Task Force on Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Policy, 1983, p. 1). They concluded that, "In essence, the skills that were once possessed by only a few must now be held by the many if the United States is to remain competitive in an advancing technological world" (p. 2) and that "equality and excellence are not mutually exclusive objectives" (p. 4). What is needed is a *fresh approach* by the federal government, which "reflects the national concern for a better educated America and that strikes a reasonable and effective balance between quality and equality" (p. 5).

Recommendations of the Task Force addressed: (a) federal government to emphasize need for better schools and better education for all young Americans; (b) establishment of Master Teachers Programs to recognize teaching excellence; (c) recognize that most important objectives of elementary and secondary school is development of literacy in the English language; (d) emphasize programs to develop basic scientific literacy among all citizens and advanced training in science and mathematics for secondary school students; (e) continued federal efforts to provide special educational programs for the poor and for the handicapped; (f) categorical programs required by the federal government should be paid for from the federal treasury; (g) "impacted" aid be extended to not only children of military personnel but of immigrants; (h) federal support for educational research efforts (e.g., factual information collection, evaluation of programs, research) into the learning process; (i) establishment of special federal fellowships for school districts to encourage creation of small, individualized programs staffed by certified teachers and run as small-scale academies (for students who need special learning environments). But, this was not the end of national studies of education for the 1980s!

Selected Characteristics of Comprehensive High School Development

The aim of this section is to analyze and summarize the preceding brief (and also selected) descriptions of the development of the comprehensive high school in the United States. The analysis is limited by the extent and depth of the review of historic documents and their interpretations. The characteristics selected for examination through history were: (a) growth in size of population served, (b) definition of comprehensive high school, (c) purpose of secondary education, (d) recommended curriculum, (e) recommended methods of instruction, (f) important issues debated, and (g) source of leadership on national commissions and studies. These characteristics are summarized in Table L.1 for the time periods addressed in the previous historical descriptions. What follows is a brief discussion of each characteristic over the 200+ year time span.

Growth in Size of Population Served

At the time the first high school was established (at least by name) in Boston in 1824 most of what would now be considered as secondary education was taking place in academies—there were some six thousand academies in 1850 scattered across the country. However, things began to change, and by 1860 there were three hundred high schools, and six thousand by 1890. They were destined to become the standard form of providing post-elementary and pre-college public education in the United States. From 1900 to 1940, the number of students enrolled in high schools about doubled every ten years; from 1940 to 1980, it doubled again. Consider the press for teachers, facilities and curriculum materials with that expansion rate—from 700,000 students in 1900, to 7,000,000 in 1940, to 14,000,000 in 1980. The continuity of this growth is a remarkable achievement in light of the critical events in United States history also taking place during these times. Part of the increase was caused by serving a larger percent of the eligible age group—from eleven percent in 1900 to seventy-three percent in 1940 and up to ninety-nine percent in 1980. In 1910 the high school had an elite clientele, while in 1980 it was serving the masses. It is little wonder that the high school came to be known as comprehensive and that it was the focus of several major national studies.

Table L.1
Summary of Selected Characteristics of Comprehensive High School Development in the United States

Characteristic	1600-1890	1890-1920	1920-1940	1940-1960	1960-1980	1980-
Some critical events (1)	1620: Plymouth Colony 1647: First public school system (MA) 1776: Declaration of Independence 1803: Louisiana purchase 1848: Gain Western territory from Mexico 1862: Civil War starts 1886: American Federation of Labor founded	1913: Federal income tax 1914: World War I starts 1917-18: U.S. in WWI 1920: Majority of population in urban areas 1920: Prohibition	1925: Scopes trials 1927: Lindberg's flight 1929: Stock market crash 1933: Roosevelt's New Deal	1941-45: U.S. in World War II 1945: Hiroshima 1947: Truman Doctrine 1950s: Televisions 1950-53: Korean War 1957: Sputnik	1961: First U.S. astronaut in space 1962: Cuban missile crisis 1964: Civil rights legislation 1965-73: U.S. in Vietnam War 1968: Watts riots 1969: Moon landing 1974: Watergate 1978: Proposition 13 1979: Iranians take hostages	1981: Columbia space flight 1982: Reagan's new federalism
Central theme	Getting started	[illegible]/social efficiency	Reorientation/being progressive	Reaction subject centering	Relevance/equity	Return to basics/ excellence
Size of population served (2)	1889-90: 359,949 (6.7% of age group)	1899-1900: 699,403 (11.4% of age group) 1909-1910: 1,115,398 (15.4% of age group) 1919-1920: 2,500,176 (32.3% of age group)	1929-1930: 4,804,255 (51.4% of age group) 1939-1940: 7,123,009 (73.3% of age group)	1949-1950: (76.8% of age group) 1959-1960: 9,590,000 (87.3% of age group)	1969-1970: 14,422,000 (92.7% of age group) 1979-1980: 16,327,000 (99.6% of age group) (Projected)	

Table 1 continued

Characteristic	1600-1890	1890-1920	1920-1940	1940-1960	1960-1980	1980-
Definition		Embraced all curriculum in one unified organization (3) Earlier called composite or cosmopolitan high school		Aims to serve needs of all youth; does not select; teaches all varieties of skills and knowledge to all kinds of youth; prepares for successful vocations (4) An American phenomenon; on e administration and one roof; for all youth of one town or neighborhood; provides good and appropriate education, both academic and vocational, in a democratic environment (5) Prepare for citizenship and immediate work or college; distinguishes widely and narrowly comprehensive using 21 characteristics (6)		

Table 1 continued

Characteristic	1600-1890	1890-1920	1920-1940	1940-1960	1960-1980	1980-
Purpose of secondary education	1600s: Prepare selected boys for college and read Bible (grammar school) 1750s: Prepare for success in life and business (academy) 1800s: Bridge from elementary school to college (high school)	1892: Prepare for life (same as prepare for college [7]) 1913: Preserve, promote and refine the way of life in democracy (10) 1935: Provide equal educational opportunity (12)	1932: Prepare for social change but not reconstruction (9) 1930: Preserve, promote and refine the way of life in democracy (10) 1935: Provide equal educational opportunity (11, 12)	1947: Equip to live in a democratic society; high school as custodian for all youth (13) 1950s: Assist in competition with communist countries in science and national defense(14) 1954: Prevent rigid social class barriers (14, 15) 1959: Search for intellectual talent among youth; provide general education for all and skills for immediate work or college education (15)	1960s: Break poverty cycle; compensate for differences in earlier opportunity (16) 1970s: Has too many purposes—overburdened; move to more specialized work, involve other institutions in providing education (17, 18, 19, 20)	Provide excellent education in basics (21, 22, 23) Keep nation technical advanced (22, 23)
Curriculum	Grammar school — classical (Latin, Greek, Bible) Academy — English, modern language, science, classics High school — English, mathematics, history, science	Similar to college (7) Basic plus limited electives; opened curriculum to modern subjects (7) Vocational education as visible addition; differential education; constants and variables (8)	Differentiation appropriate — how soon, how much (9) Flexibility to local level (10)	General curriculum in addition to vocational and college preparatory (13) Emphasis to subject matter, particularly science and mathematics (6)	Criteria for widely comprehensive school developed (15) Electives important together with counseling (15) Shift to learner as concern (18, 19, 20) More freedom in choice (18, 19, 20) Include public service (18, 19, 20) Reduce age of leaving (20)	New basics — science, mathematics, English, social studies and computer science (and foreign language for college bound) (22, 23)

Table 1 continued

Characteristic	1600-1890	1890-1920	1920-1940	1940-1960	1960-1980	1980-
Instruction	Grammar school — stern learning environment	Train power of observation, memory, expression and reasoning (7) Make relevant to life (8)	Student more active (9, 10) Concern for relevance to student (9, 10)	Return to mental discipline (14, 6) Discovery method of scientist (6)	Link to adults and community (18, 19, 20) Humanize school (15) Alternative learning places to school (17, 18, 19, 20) More independent study (18, 19, 20)	Better use of school time (22) Higher expectations for students (22, 23)
Issues	- Able to read and understand Bible - Getting education for children (male) of elite - Suit needs of western expansion - Obtaining skilled workers for industry - Education as state and local responsibility - Using public resources for education	- Relation to college - Degree of differentiation in student programs - Relative emphasis on classics versus modern subjects - High school for the masses? - Useful to real life - Social efficiency - Context of democracy - Vocational guidance	- High school as custodian - Less bright students - Role in Social reconstruction - No clear purpose - Appreciation for heritage - Responsibility to community - Challenge to gifted - Knowing student - Conditions for learning - Developing creative talents - Relevant to youth concerns - English - Continuity in programs - Finding employment - Equal opportunity	- Dealing with baby boom - Seeming failure of progressivism - Handling marginal students - Education as aimless - Critique of schools and education professions - Turn to subject matter specialists - School as meritocracy - Use of research and development - Separate but equal not adequate - Specialized versus comprehensive high school	- Diversity in schools - Ability grouping and tracking - Marketable skills - Community control - Accountability - Open school - End to expansion - Declining attendance rates - How much to promise - Clearer mission - Diversity in students - Developing positive attitude - Vouchers - Equality of results	- Excellence - Mediocrity in school - Merit pay for teachers - Retaining equity - More time for school - Holding school responsible - Master teachers

Table 1 continued

Characteristic	1600-1890	1890-1920	1920-1940	1940-1960	1960-1980	1980-
Membership of national commissions studies		Higher education (7) Secondary school administrators and teachers (8)	Secondary school administrators and university professors	Wide variety (13, 14) University (6, 16)	Education profession	Higher education, business and industry, federal policymakers

Sources:

1. *World Book Encyclopedia*
2. Tanner, D. *Secondary Education: Perspectives and Prospects.*
3. Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary School.
4. Keller, F. J. *The Comprehensive High School.*
5. Conant, J. B. *The American High School Today* (citing John Gardner)
6. Conant, J. B. *The American High School Today.*
7. Committee on Secondary School Studies
8. Commission on Reorganization of Secondary Education.
9. Committee on Reorientation of Secondary Education.
10. Commission on Relation of School and College.
11. American Youth Commission Survey.
12. Education Policies Commission.
13. Commission on Life Adjustment Education.
14. Committee for the White House Conference on Education. *Report to the President.*
15. Conant, J. *The Comprehensive High School.*
16. Coleman, J. *Equality of Education Opportunity.*
17. National Commission on Reform of Secondary Education.
18. Panel on Youth of the President's Science Advisory Committee. *Youth: Transition to Adulthood.*
19. National Panel on High Schools and Adolescent Education. *The Education of Adolescents.*
20. Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Education. *Giving Youth a Better Chance.*
21. Adler, M. J. *The Paideia Proposal: An Educational Manifesto.*
22. National Commission on Excellence in Education.
23. Twentieth Century Fund Task Force on Elementary and Secondary Education Policy. *A Nation at Risk.*

Definition of Comprehensive High School

The first use found of the term *comprehensive* in reference to the high school was by the Commission on Reorganization of Secondary Education, appointed in 1913 by the National Education Association. It was used in reference to a high school that embraced all curriculum in one unified organization. Earlier, the terms *composite* and *cosmopolitan* seem to have had a similar meaning. The term *comprehensive* was coined at a time when there was a reaction to the: (a) large influence of higher education over the high school curriculum; (b) concern for the usefulness of the curriculum to real life for most students; (c) desire that secondary education become part of the common education for everyone; and (d) fact that vocational education was a visible concern to high school (because of need for trained workers, high dropout rates, meeting needs of less bright students and the wish to make a clearer link of high school to preparation for life). It was also a time when vocational education was growing rapidly, but in separate institutions, and a time (the only) when a national commission was largely made up of educational professionals and chaired by a vocational educator (Kingsley). Along with the term *comprehensive* came the terms *constants*, *variables*, and *electives* in reference to specific courses or subjects. Vocational education was categorized among the variables, although preparation for vocation was one of seven cardinal principles identified to direct secondary education.

Later in the 1950s, John Gardner and James Conant would revisit the definition of a comprehensive high school, suggesting it was to essentially serve all youth from a given geographic area under one roof (or series of roofs) and one administration. It was characterized as a particularly American phenomenon in contrast to European educational systems with their specialized secondary schools. Although the issue of comprehensive versus specialized schools surfaced for debate several times, the comprehensive high school always retained support. Perhaps the decision was really made back in 1913 and major change after that time would have been difficult to achieve given the high schools already in place.

Interestingly, the major criticism of the 1913 Commission Report came from David Snedden, who maintained that only imitation (and not real) vocational education could occur in a comprehensive high school. Conant (1959) rationalized the comprehensive high school by its better fit to a democratic society giving equal status to people and jobs and the need for youth to mix while learning. Another purpose voiced not quite so loudly was that the comprehensive high school best served Conant's idea of the high school as a

meritocracy, allowing the widest possible pool of youth from which to sort out intellectual talent. Keller (1955), studying the comprehensive high school at this time, raised the issue about whether a democracy requires uniformity or sameness in high school organization and available curriculum—that there is nothing undemocratic about diversity. He reasoned that effective and efficient occupational preparation requires the class time, teaching expertise and extensive facilities made possible by specialization in schools.

Purpose of Comprehensive High School

In some ways it is being simple-minded to attempt to capture and characterize the change in purpose as well as other features of secondary education in one chart embellished by a few paragraphs of discussion. Rather, what is done here is to highlight the aspects of purpose reflected in the national studies and commission reports, assuming they relate to then-present school practices and hopes for the future. Early in the development of the high school, and for that reason perhaps most influential in its continuing purpose and organization, the purpose of the high school was to prepare a relatively small elite group of students for efficient entry into higher education.

Through the 1950s, a major purpose of several of the national study commissions was to review ways to better articulate the relation between high school and college, with the high school assumed to be the institution needing to change. While the purpose of preparing a select group of students for college came under criticism, it always seems to remain a very high priority in the discussion and recommendations concerning the purposes of the high school. Early in the high school development (1890s), the issue of preparation for college was handled by recommending that the high school focus on preparation for life; however, the best preparation for life was assumed to be the best preparation for college—this was when high schools were serving a very select group of students.

Later, as the high school needed to serve a much larger group of students (some not so oriented or endowed with ability for intellectual scholarship), and as the need for a trained labor force increased, the overall purpose remained preparation for life. But within this broad mission statement, the purpose was differentiated to be to provide some advanced (beyond elementary) general or common education, and also either preparation for college or for immediate entry to work.

In the 1930s the issue of education's role in social reconstruction was especially debated. Resolution seemed to be that education should play a role in preparing the young for social change but should appropriately leave reconstruction to the larger democratic process. Also starting during this time was concern for assuring equal educational opportunity in the purpose of public education. Each generation was to have a fair and fresh start in the competition for benefits of our society. Schools were to play a major role in the reshuffling process, and later, in the 1960s, with actually compensating for earlier educational deprivations for certain groups.

In the 1950s, with the advent of the Cold War and Sputnik, education was recognized for its role in assuring *national purpose*—national defense and technical superiority. The federal government began to take more initiative (particularly as evidenced in federal expenditures) in curriculum reform, especially as related to mathematics and science. In the 1960s, federal interest turned to the role of education in the War on Poverty. The purpose of education at this time was becoming all encompassing—the criticism soon became that education was aimless and not doing a very good job of anything. It was suggested that the high school begin to restrict its purpose as a means to focus energy and resources and thereby demonstrate effects; discussion distinguished the comprehensive high school from comprehensive education—the latter involving many other community institutions besides the school.

Curriculum of Comprehensive High School

Again, the basic organization and importance associated with various subjects of the curriculum in the high school appears to have been decided very early. The illustrative student programs recommended by the Committee of Secondary School Studies appointed in 1892 are strikingly like those recommended by the high school studies of 1983—all of the basics are there in English, mathematics, science, social studies, and foreign language (only computers were missing in 1892 and classical languages have been replaced by the modern); electives were permitted but there was very little time remaining for them and they were not central to the curriculum. More of the flexibility was in the amount of time balance between the basic subjects, particularly the focus on foreign languages.

A major difference was that in 1892, the criticism of the recommendations came from those teaching the classics who had lost time to the *modern* subjects of science, history, and geography and modern languages. In 1980, the criticism seems to have come

from those teaching the electives (such as vocational education) who are losing time to the *new basics*. Another major difference was that in 1892, the public high schools enrolled about 500,000 students (6.7 percent of age group) while in 1980, enrollment was 16.3 million (99 percent of age group).

Between these two points in time the curriculum of the high school seemed to move in waves, altering between more electives and flexibility in curriculum and student programs and constrictions with re-emphasis on certain aspects of the curriculum. For example, the *life adjustment education* movement in the late 1940s resulted in the addition of the general education track to the curriculum (along with college preparatory and vocational)—thereby adding electives and flexibility. However, with Sputnik in the late 1950s, there was a shift to emphasis on science and mathematics with revised curriculum materials constructed by subject matter specialists (rather than educators) and an increase in high school graduation requirements in these areas. Following in the 1960s was the concern for lack of relevance in the school curriculum and the inequality in educational opportunity across schools in different areas. The result was more focus on the learner and learning problems, return to the education profession as a source of curriculum, and an increase in electives and flexibility in student programs to meet individual needs. Perhaps the reports of the early 1980s are simply a *turn of the wheel* to more focus and prescription as a response to being overly flexible and its consequences.

Methods of Instruction in the Comprehensive High School

The cycling—which seems apparent in the curriculum—also appears evident in methods of instruction, from the stern learning environment of the grammar school, which seems to have been carried into the early high schools, to emphasis on students' problems and having the student active (progressive movement—1920s and 30s), to a *return* to mental discipline (1940s) in combination with discovery methods of science (new math and physics—1950s and 60s), to attempts to humanize and *open* the school (1970s), to higher expectations and again more discipline and rigor (1980s). Perhaps an optimistic view is that we are still in search of the best method or combination of methods for instruction in the comprehensive high school.

Issues Concerning the Comprehensive High School

It is not too difficult to summarize the issues addressed by the various national commissions and studies of the comprehensive high school over time—in many ways they have remained the same, with a few added or subtracted or only a change in emphasis. These issues can be categorized under the following headings:

1. What should be the purpose (e.g., all youth or a select few, social efficiency, social reconstruction, sorting of intellectual ability, general or specific education, equalizing opportunity, insuring national security)?

2. What curriculum best follows from the purpose (e.g., common or differentiated, classics or modern subjects, academic or vocational, essential or relevant, constants or electives, continuity or flexibility, gifted or special, educator or subject matter specialist, community or state responsibility, diversity or focus, school or community)?

3. What instructional methods are best used to teach the curriculum for the intended purpose (e.g., teacher as source of knowledge or guide, degree of needed knowledge about student by teacher, conditions for learning, developing creative talents, handling diversity of students, *opening up* the school, use of community, best use of time, assuring vigor and results)? and

4. How should the high school be organized (e.g., specialized or comprehensive facilities, local or state and federal governance, education of teachers and administrators, role of support services such as guidance and special education, segregated or integrated schools, reward system for teachers)?

What *has* changed over time was the *responses* to these issues. These changes have already been described in the above sections of this report.

Source of Leadership in Resolving Issues

One of the factors that may have influenced how the above cited issues relating to secondary education were resolved was who was asked. That is, what interests were represented on the national commissions and studies reviewed in this paper? Although it is difficult in some cases to ascertain the professional responsibilities of commission members

or study staff, at least some things are known. The Committee on Secondary School Studies, which set the pattern for secondary schools in terms of purpose, course offerings, and schedule back in the 1890s, was composed of five university presidents, a college professor, a commissioner of education and three principals (the chairperson was Charles Eliot, President of Harvard). Perhaps the next most influential commission using the term *comprehensive high school*, adding vocational education to the high school curriculum, and formulating the Seven Cardinal Principles of Education, was the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education, formed in 1913. In marked contrast to the earlier committee, it was chaired (and the report mostly authored) by Charles Kingsley, who had recently been a mathematics instructor at Brooklyn Manual Training High School, and membership of the commission was drawn largely from secondary schools rather than universities. Similar, but not as drastic, differences in recommendations and membership can be observed in looking across the commissions and study groups which followed.

The generalizations made here are very tentative—it is a large and risky step from knowing a person's occupation to that of what recommendations they would make about secondary education. Certainly many of the members were parents and had children who would be affected by their recommendations about the secondary school as only one reason for taking a broader perspective. A study which I have already begun is to try to gather much more information about the characteristics of commission members, both in the past and for more current groups, studying and recommending changes in the secondary school.

References

Adler, J. M. (1982). *The paideia proposal: An educational manifesto.* New York, NY: Macmillan.

American Council on Education. (1938). *Youth tell their story.* Washington, DC: American Countil on Youth.

Bell, B.I. (1949). *Crisis in education: A challenge to American complacency.* New York, NY: Whittlesey House.

Bestor, A. E. (1953). *Educational wastelands: The retreat from learning in our public schools.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Butts, R. F. (1972). Search for freedom—The story of American education. In J. A. Johnson, H. W. Collins, V. L. Dupuis, & J. H. Johansen (Eds.), *Foundations of American education: Readings.* Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Education (Clark Kerr, Chairperson). (1979). *Giving youth a better chance.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Church, R. L., & Sedlak, M. W. (1976). *Education in the United States: An interpretive history.* New York, NY: Free Press.

Coleman, J. S. (1966). *Equality of educational opportunity.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Coleman, J. S., Bremner, R. H., Clark, B. R., Davis, J. B., Eichorn, D. H., Griliches, Z., Kett, J. F., Ryder, N. B., & Doering, Z. B. (1974). *Youth: Transition to adulthood report of the panel on youth of the President's Science Advisory Committee.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Committee for the White House Conference on Education. (1956). *A report to the President.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Conant, J. B. (1959). *The American high school today: A first report to interested citizens.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Conant, J. B. (1967). *The comprehensive high school: A second report to interested citizens.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Cray, D. (1982). The 1980s: Season for high school reform. *Educational Leadership, 39*(8), 564-568.

Cremin, L. A. (1970). *American education: The colonial experience.* New York, NY Harper & Row.

Cremin, L. A. (1980). *American education: The national experience.* New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Hutchins, R. M. (1953). *The conflict in education in a democratic society.* New York, NY: Harper Brothers.

Jencks, Christopher (1972). *Inequality: A reassessment of the effect of family and schooling in America.* New York, NY: Basil Books.

Jensen, A. R. (1972). *Genetics and education.* New York, NY: Harper & Row. 153.9 J453.

Keller, F. J. (1955). *The comprehensive high school.* New York, NY: Harper & Brothers.

Krug, E. A. (1969). *The shaping of the American high school, 1880-1920.* Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Lynd, A. (1953). *Quackery in the public schools.* Boston, MA: Little, Brown.

National Commission on Excellence in Education (David Pierpont Gardner, Chairperson). (1963). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

National Commission on the Reform of Secondary Education (B. Frank Brown, Chairperson). (1973). *The reform of secondary education: A report to the public and the profession.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

National Panel on High School and Adolescent Education (John Henry Martin, Chairperson). (1976). *The education of adolescents.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Oliva, P. F. (1967). *The secondary school today.* Cleveland, Ohio: World.

Raubinger, F. M., Rowe, H. G., Piper, D. L., & West, C. K. (1969). *The development of secondary education.* London, England: Macmillan.

Rickover, H. G. (1959). *Education and freedom.* New York, NY: E. P. Dutton.

Silberman, C. E. (1970). *Crisis in the classroom: The remaking of American education.* New York, NY: Random House.

Smith, M. B. (1949). *And madly teach: A layman looks at public school education.* Chicago, IL: Henry Regnery.

Smith, M. B. (1954). *The diminished mind: A study of planned mediocrity in our public schools.* Chicago, IL Henry Regnery.

Tanner, D. (1972). *Secondary education: Perspectives and prospects.* New York, NY: Macmillan.

Tanner, D. (1982). The comprehensive high school in American education. *Educational Leadership, 39*(8), 606-613.

Twentieth Century Fund Task Force on Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Policy (Robert Wood, Chairperson). (1983). *Making the grade: Report of the twentieth century fund task force on federal elementary and secondary education policy.* New York, NY: Twentieth Century Fund.

U.S. Office of Education. (1951). *Life adjustment education for every youth* (Bulletin 1951, No. 22). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.